



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,188	10/18/2001	Chia-Hsin Li	API110HO	4860

20178 7590 12/08/2006

EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT
2580 ORCHARD PARKWAY, SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/045,188

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Victor Lesniewski

Art Unit

2152

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7, 9, 11, 13-23 and 28-31.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

VZ

[Signature]
BUNJOE JARSENCHONWANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments concerning the prior art are not persuasive.

Concerning the argument that Grate does not teach the web browser launching the stand-alone program, it is noted that this is not a limitation of the claims. The claims state that the control module launches the stand-alone application. Further, Grate does teach launching local applications "from" a browser as he explicitly states initiating the function call from the browser. See the previously cited lines to Grate, column 2, lines 29-44.

Concerning the argument relating to application options, it is believed that any options related to the application meet this limitation as the term has not been further defined in the claims (with the exception of claim 29 which was rejected under a separate rationale).

The claims remain rejected over the prior art as previously presented.

Continuation of 13. Other: The applicant's reply is sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 concerning the level of access permission. See pages 8 and 9 of the applicant's remarks submitted 11/22/2006. Although the specification does not explicitly state that the control module has greater access permission to the client device, the applicant has sufficiently explained how this is true in relation to the functionality of the specification, and has distinctly pointed out the specific functionality of the present invention which results in greater access permission for the control module. It is further noted that the applicant has admitted on the record that this limitation of the claims is well known in the art. See the first full paragraph of page 9 of the remarks submitted 11/22/2006.

The applicant's amendments are sufficient to overcome the remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Thus, all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 presented in the action dated 8/25/2006 have been withdrawn.

The proposed amendment has been entered, but claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13-23, and 28-31 remain rejected over the prior art rejections as presented in the action dated 8/25/2006.